

SENATE RECORD VOTE ANALYSIS

104th Congress
1st Session

Vote No. 348

August 1, 1995, 6:07 p.m.
Page S-11084 Temp. Record

ENERGY-WATER APPROPRIATIONS/Conferees on Line-Item Veto

SUBJECT: Energy and Water Development Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 1996 . . . H.R. 1905. Dorgan amendment No. 2057.

ACTION: AMENDMENT AGREED TO, 83-14

SYNOPSIS: As reported, H.R. 1905, the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 1995, will provide \$20.557 billion in new budget authority (BA) to the Department of Defense's Civil Corp of Engineers, to the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Reclamation, to the relevant offices within the Department of Energy, and to related independent agencies and commissions.

The Dorgan amendment would express the sense of the Senate that the Speaker of the House should move to appoint conferees on S. 4, the line-item veto bill, immediately, so that the House and Senate may resolve their differences.

Those favoring the amendment contended:

The Dorgan amendment is a model of simplicity. It expresses the sense of the Senate that the House should appoint conferees on S. 4, the line-item veto bill. Most Members in both Houses say they favor giving the President line-item veto authority. The House passed a version of the line-item veto on February 6, 1995; the Senate passed a version on March 23, 1995; the House took up the Senate bill and passed it after substituting its version on May 17, 1995; the Senate appointed conferees on June 20, 1995. The House has yet to appoint conferees, and the Speaker has said that it is unlikely that a conference will be held this year. Therefore, the President will not have a chance to veto line items in the appropriations bills we are about to pass. Some commentators have suggested that certain Republicans do not want this particular President, who is a Democrat, to have line-item veto authority. We hope that this suggestion is incorrect, but unfortunately, supporters of the Dorgan amendment, both Democrat and Republican, believe that there is some merit to the charge. The House should not delay this matter further. By expressing the sense of the Senate that the House should act, we will hopefully pressure it into action. We trust our colleagues agree, and will accordingly join us in

(See other side)

YEAS (83)				NAYS (14)		NOT VOTING (2)	
Republican (46 or 87%)		Democrats (37 or 84%)		Republicans (7 or 13%)	Democrats (7 or 16%)	Republicans (1)	Democrats (1)
Abraham	Kassebaum	Akaka	Hollings	Cochran	Byrd	Gramm- ²	Exon- ²
Ashcroft	Kempthorne	Baucus	Inouye	Coverdell	Dodd		
Bennett	Kyl	Biden	Kennedy	Dole	Johnston		
Bond	Lott	Bingaman	Kerry	Gorton	Moseley-Braun		
Brown	Lugar	Bradley	Kerry	Hatfield	Nunn		
Burns	McCain	Breaux	Kohl	Jeffords	Pell		
Campbell	McConnell	Bryan	Lautenberg	Mack	Sarbanes		
Chafee	Murkowski	Bumpers	Leahy				
Coats	Nickles	Conrad	Levin				
Cohen	Packwood	Daschle	Lieberman				
Craig	Pressler	Dorgan	Mikulski				
D'Amato	Roth	Feingold	Moynihan				
DeWine	Santorum	Feinstein	Murray				
Domenici	Shelby	Ford	Pryor				
Faircloth	Simpson	Glenn	Reid				
Frist	Smith	Graham	Robb				
Grams	Snowe	Harkin	Rockefeller				
Grassley	Specter	Heflin	Simon				
Gregg	Stevens		Wellstone				
Hatch	Thomas						
Helms	Thompson						
Hutchison	Thurmond						
Inhofe	Warner						

VOTING PRESENT(1)
Boxer

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

- 1—Official Business
- 2—Necessarily Absent
- 3—Illness
- 4—Other

SYMBOLS:

- AY—Announced Yea
- AN—Announced Nay
- PY—Paired Yea
- PN—Paired Nay

voting in favor of this amendment.

Those opposing the amendment contended:

We object to this amendment for three reasons. First, the Senate has no business telling the House what it should or should not do, just as the House should not try to dictate the Senate's actions. Starting down this road will destroy the comity between the two bodies, greatly complicating the legislative process. Second, some of us oppose the line-item veto as a matter of principle, whether the President is a Democrat or a Republican, and we are thus pleased to see this delay in going to conference. Third, many of us, including Democrats, are dismayed at some of President Clinton's recent political maneuvering. First he called for a line-item veto so he could cut spending and tax expenditures, then he insisted he would not cut tax expenditures, then he accused Congress of being behind schedule in passing appropriations bills, and then he made the base assertion that Congress was interested only in taking "care of its own business" because it passed the legislative branch appropriations bill first. We would prefer it if our President chose the high road by sticking to the issues instead of seeking political accommodations, mischaracterizing Congress' pace, and slandering Congress for passing a legislative branch appropriations bill that cuts spending by 10 percent. We find these three reasons for voting against the Dorgan amendment to be compelling, and therefore urge its rejection.